arXiv:1609.05942v1 [cs.CC] 19 Sep 2016

On the relative power of reduction notions in arithmetic circuit complexity

Christian Ikenmeyer
Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarland Informatics Campus, Germany

Stefan Mengel
CNRS, CRIL UMR 8188, France

September 21, 2016

Abstract

We show that the two main reduction notions in arithmetic circuit complexity, p-projections and c-reductions, differ in power. We do so by showing unconditionally that there are polynomials that are VNP-complete under c-reductions but not under p-projections. We also show that the question of which polynomials are VNP-complete under which type of reductions depends on the underlying field.

Keywords: arithmetic circuits, reductions, p-projection, c-reduction, Hamiltonian cycle polynomial

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 68Q15.

2012 ACM Computing Classification System: Theory of computation – Computational complexity and cryptography – Problems, reductions and completeness

1 Introduction

While there is a plethora of different reduction notions that have been studied in computational complexity (see e.g. [HO02] for an overview), it has often been observed that in nearly all NP-completeness proofs in the literature logarithmic space many-one reductions suffice. In contrast to NP-completeness, many #P-hardness results in counting complexity are not shown with many-one reductions but with the more permissive Turing-reductions and the #P-hardness under many-one reductions remains an open problem. It is natural to ask if there is a fundamental difference between both #P-hardness notions. Note that the question of the relative power of reduction notions for NP-completeness has been studied and there are known separations under different complexity assumptions, see e.g. the survey [Pav03].

In this short note, we answer an analogous question for arithmetic circuit complexity, the algebraic sibling of counting complexity. In arithmetic circuit complexity the most usual reduction notion are so-called p-projections. Despite being very restricted, p-projections have been used to show nearly all of the completeness results in the area since the ground-breaking work of Valiant [Val79]. It was only more recently that c-reductions, a more permissive notion more similar to Turing- or oracle-reductions, have been defined in [Bü00] and used for some results (see e.g. [BK09, dRA12, DMM$^+$14]). Again the question comes up if there is a fundamental difference between these two notions of reductions. In fact, it was exactly this uncertainty about the relative power of p-projections and c-reductions that motivated the recent work Mahajan and Saurabh [MS16]: For the first time they prove a natural problem complete for the arithmetic circuit class VP under p-projections, where before there existed only such result under c-reductions.

In this paper we answer the question of the relative strength of of p-projections and c-reductions: We show unconditionally that over every field $\mathbb{F}$ there are explicit families of polynomials that are VNP-complete over $\mathbb{F}$ under c-reductions that are not VNP-complete over $\mathbb{F}$ under p-projections. We also show that the question which polynomials are complete under which reductions depends on the underlying field in a rather subtle way. It is a well known phenomenon that the permanent family, which is VNP-complete under p-projections over fields of characteristic different from 2, is contained in VP over fields

of characteristic 2 and thus likely not VNP-hard there. We present a more subtle situation: We give an explicit family of polynomials that is VNP-complete under c-reductions over all fields with more than 2 elements and that is even VNP-complete under p-projections over a large class of fields including the complex numbers, but over the real numbers it is only VNP-complete under c-reductions and not under p-projections.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Dennis Amelunxen for helful discussions. Some of the research leading to this article was performed while the authors were at the Department of Mathematics at the University of Paderborn and at Texas A&M University.

2 Preliminaries

We only give some very minimal notions of arithmetic circuit complexity. For more details we refer the reader to the very accessible recent survey [Mah14].

The basic objects to be computed in arithmetic circuit complexity are polynomials. More precisely, one considers so called p-families of polynomials, which are sequences (f_n) of multivariate polynomials such that the number of variables in f_n and the degree of f_n are both bounded by a polynomial in n. We assume that each p-family computes polynomials over a field $\mathbb{F}$ which will vary in this paper but is fixed for each p-family.

A polynomial f in the variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ is a projection of a polynomial g, in symbols $f \leq g$, if $f(X_1, \ldots, X_n) = g(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ where the a_i are taken from $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\} \cup \mathbb{F}$. The first reduction notion we consider in this paper are so-called p-projections: A p-family (f_n) is a p-projection of another p-family (g_n), symbol $(f_n) \leq_{\mathrm{p}} (g_n)$ if there is a polynomially bounded function t such that

$$\exists n_0 \forall n \geq n_0 \colon f_n \leq g_{t(n)}.$$

Intuitively, p-projections appear to be a very weak notion of reductions although surprisingly the bulk of completeness results in arithmetic circuit complexity can be shown with them. For some p-families, though, showing hardness with p-projections appears to be hard, and consequently, a more permissive reduction notion called c-reductions has also been used.

The oracle complexity $L^g(f)$ of a polynomial f with oracle g is the minimum number of arithmetic operations $+$, $-$, $\times$, and evaluations of g at previously computed values that are sufficient to compute f from the variables $X_1, X_2, \ldots$ and constants in $\mathbb{F}$.

Let (f_n) and (g_n) be p-families of polynomials. We call (f_n) a c-*reduction* of (g_n), symbol $(f_n) \leq_{\mathrm{c}} (g_n)$, if and only if there is a polynomially bounded function $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that the map $n \mapsto L^{g_{t(n)}}(f_n)$ is polynomially bounded.

Intuitively, if $(f_n) \leq_{\mathrm{c}} (g_n)$, then we can compute the polynomial in (f_n) with a polynomial number of arithmetic operations and oracle calls to $g_{t(n)}$, where $t(n)$ is polynomially bounded.

Let C_n denote the group of cyclic cyclic permutations on n symbols and define the nth Hamiltonian cycle polynomial HC_n as $\mathrm{HC}_n := \sum_{\pi \in C_n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} X_{i,\pi(i)}$.

To keep these preliminaries lightweight, we omit the usual definition of VNP and instead define VNP to consist of all p-families (g_n) with $(g_n) \leq_{\mathrm{p}} (\mathrm{HC}_n)$.

A p-family (g_n) that satisfies $(f_n) \leq_{\mathrm{p}} (g_n)$ for all $f_n \in \mathsf{VNP}$ is called VNP-hard under p-projections or VNP-p-hard for short. Analogously, a p-family (g_n) that satisfies $(f_n) \leq_{\mathrm{c}} (g_n)$ for all $f_n \in \mathsf{VNP}$ is called VNP-hard under c-reductions or VNP-c-hard for short. If (g_n) is VNP-p-hard and contained in VNP, then (g_n) is call VNP-p-complete. Analogously for VNP-c-completeness. Clearly if a family is VNP-p-complete, then it is also VNP-c-complete.

Note that a p-family (g_n) is VNP-p-hard (resp. VNP-c-hard) iff $(\mathrm{HC}_n) \leq_{\mathrm{p}} (g_n)$ (resp. $(\mathrm{HC}_n) \leq_{\mathrm{c}} (g_n)$).

3 c-reductions are strictly stronger than p-projections

In this section, we show that there are polynomials that are VNP-c-complete but not VNP-p-complete. Let X denote a new variable, unused by HC_n for any n. Define

$$P_n := X \cdot \mathrm{HC}_n + (\mathrm{HC}_n)^2.$$

Note that P_n is defined for every field. We remark that (P_n) can easily be shown to be contained in VNP, because $\mathrm{HC}_n \in \mathsf{VNP}$ and the class VNP is closed under multiplication and addition [Val82] (see also [Bü00, Theorem 2.19]).

3.1 Lemma. *(P_n) is VNP-c-complete over every field.*

Proof. Fix a field $\mathbb{F}$. For field elements $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$ let $P_n(X \leftarrow \alpha)$ denote P_n with variable X set to α. We observe that

$$P_n(X \leftarrow 1) - P_n(X \leftarrow 0) = \mathrm{HC}_n$$

and thus P_n is VNP-c-complete. □

3.2 Lemma. *(P_n) is not VNP-p-complete over any field.*

Proof. Let f be any univariate polynomial in some variable Y and let f be of odd degree at least 3. We show that f is not a projection of P_n for any n, which finishes the proof because then the constant p-family (f) is not a p-projection of (P_n).

For a multivariate polynomial h let $\deg_Y(h)$ denote the Y-degree of h, which is the degree of h interpreted as a univariate polynomial in Y over the polynomial ring with additional variables. Let A be an $n \times n$ matrix whose entries are variables and constants. We denote by $P_n(A)$ the linear projection of P_n given by A. We now analyze $\deg_Y(P_n(A))$. Clearly $\deg_Y(X(A)) \leq 1$. If $\deg_Y(\mathrm{HC}_n(A)) \leq 1$, then $\deg_Y(P_n(A)) \leq 2 < 3 \leq \deg_Y(f)$ and thus $P_n(A) \neq f$. If $\deg_Y(\mathrm{HC}_n(A)) \geq 2$, then $\deg_Y(P_n(A)) = \deg_Y((\mathrm{HC}_n(A))^2) = 2\deg_Y(\mathrm{HC}_n(A))$. But $\deg_Y(f)$ is an odd number, so in this case we also have $P_n(A) \neq f$. □

As a corollary we get that c-reductions yield strictly more complete problems that p-projections.

3.3 Theorem. *For every field $\mathbb{F}$, (P_n) is VNP-c-complete over $\mathbb{F}$, but not VNP-p-complete over $\mathbb{F}$.*

4 The dependence on the field

In this section we construct a family (Q_n) of polynomials that is is VNP-c-complete over all fields with more than two elements, but over the real numbers (Q_n) is not VNP-p-complete. This shows that the relative power of different reductions notions depends on the field and is thus likely quite complicated to characterize in general.

We consider the polynomials Q_n defined on the matrix $(X_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ defined by

$$Q_n := \sum_{\pi \in C_n} \prod_{i \in [n]} X_{i,\pi(i)} + \sum_{\pi \in C_n} \prod_{i \in [n]} X^2_{i,\pi(i)}.$$

Note that Q_n is similar to the polynomial P_n considered before. But unlike P_n the homogeneous part of degree n^2 of Q_n is *not* $(\mathrm{HC}_n)^2$ but only contains a subset of the monomials.

Using Valiant's criterion, it is easy to see that $(Q_n) \in \mathsf{VNP}$, see for example [Bü00][Proposition 2.20].

Although from its algebraic properties Q_n might look very different from P_n, the following Lemma can be proved exactly as Lemma 3.1.

4.1 Lemma. *(Q_n) is VNP-c-complete over every field with more than 2 elements.*

Proof. Fix a field $\mathbb{F}$ with more than 2 elements. The proof is a simple interpolation argument. Choose $a \in \mathbb{F}$ with $a \notin \{0, 1\}$. For a variable matrix

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} X_{1,1} & X_{1,2} & \cdots & X_{1,n} \\ X_{2,1} & X_{2,2} & \cdots & X_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ X_{n,1} & X_{n,2} & \cdots & X_{n,n} \end{pmatrix}$$

let $\bar{X}$ denote X with the first row scaled by a:

$$\bar{X} = \begin{pmatrix} aX_{1,1} & aX_{1,2} & \cdots & aX_{1,n} \\ X_{2,1} & X_{2,2} & \cdots & X_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ X_{n,1} & X_{n,2} & \cdots & X_{n,n} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly $\mathrm{HC}_n(\bar{X}) = a\mathrm{HC}_n(X)$. Moreover,

$$Q_n(\bar{X}) = a\mathrm{HC}_n(X) + a^2 \sum_{\pi \in C_n} \prod_{i \in [n]} X^2_{i,\pi(i)}.$$

Therefore

$$(a - a^2)\mathrm{HC}_n(X) = Q_n(\bar{X}) - a^2 Q_n(X).$$

But $a - a^2 = a(1-a) \neq 0$ because $a \notin \{0, 1\}$. We conclude

$$\mathrm{HC}_n(X) = \frac{1}{a-a^2} Q_n(\bar{X}) - \frac{a^2}{a-a^2} Q_n(X).$$

It follows that Q_n is even VNP-c-complete under linear p-projections, a restricted form of c-reductions (see [Bü00, p. 54]). □

We now show that over the real numbers Lemma 4.1 cannot be improved from c-reductions to p-projections.

4.2 Lemma. *(Q_n) is not* VNP-p-*complete over* $\mathbb{R}$.

Proof. We show that the polynomial X is not a projection of Q_n for any n. Assume this were not the case. Then there is an $(n \times n)$-matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ whose entries are variables or constants such that $P_n(A) = X$. W.l.o.g. we assume that no other variables than X appear in A, so $a_{ij} \in \{X\} \cup \mathbb{R}$. Let $\sigma \in C_n$ be an n-cycle such that $\prod_{i=1}^n a_{i\sigma(i)}$ has maximal degree. Obviously this degree is at least 1. Then the monomial $\prod_{i=1}^n a^2_{i\sigma(i)}$ has at least degree 2 and it cannot cancel out in Q_n because

- it cannot cancel with any $\prod_{i=1}^n a_{i\mu(i)}$ for an n-cycle μ, because those all have smaller degrees, and
- it cannot cancel out with any $\prod_{i=1}^n a^2_{i\mu(i)}$, because those all have positive coefficients in $Q_n(A)$.

Thus $Q_n(A)$ has degree at least 2, which implies that $Q_n(A) \neq X$. □

Interestingly, Lemma 4.2 does not generalize to arbitrary fields.

4.3 Lemma. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field such that there are elements $a_1, \ldots, a_s$ with $\sum_{i=1}^s a_i \neq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^s a_i^2 = 0$. Then (Q_n) is* VNP-p-*complete over $\mathbb{F}$.*

Proof. For an $(n \times n)$-matrix A let $\mathrm{HC}(A)$ be the Hamiltonian cycle polynomial evaluated at A and set $\mathrm{HC}(A^{(2)}) := \sum_{\sigma \in C_n} \prod_{i=1}^n a^2_{i\sigma(i)}$. With this notation clearly $Q_n(A) = \mathrm{HC}(A) + \mathrm{HC}(A^{(2)})$. ¿From an $(s \times s)$-matrix A and a $(t \times t)$-matrix B we construct the $(s+t+2) \times (s+t+2)$ *Hamiltonian connection matrix* $\mathrm{con}(A, B)$ as follows. Let G_A be the labeled digraph with adjacency matrix A and let G_B be the labeled digraph with adjacency matrix B. The vertex corresponding to the first row and column in A is called v_A, analogously for v_B. The labeled digraph G'_A is defined by replacing v_A in G_A by two vertices v_A^{in} and v_A^{out} such that the edges going into v_A now go into v_A^{in} and the edges coming out of v_A now come out of v_A^{out}. This operation increases the total number of vertices by one: $|V(G_A)| + 1 = |V(G'_A)|$.

We create a labeled digraph $G_{\mathrm{con}(A,B)}$ as the union of G'_A and G'_B with two additional edges, one going from v_A^{in} to v_B^{out} and the other from v_B^{in} to v_A^{out}, both labelled with 1. Let $\mathrm{con}(A, B)$ denote the $(s+t+2) \times (s+t+2)$ adjacency matrix of $G_{\mathrm{con}(A,B)}$.

By construction we have a bijection between the set of Hamiltonian cycles in $G_{\mathrm{con}(A,B)}$ and the set of pairs (c_A, c_B) of Hamiltonian cycles c_A in G_A and c_B in G_B. Thus $\mathrm{HC}(\mathrm{con}(A, B)) = \mathrm{HC}(A)\mathrm{HC}(B)$ and $\mathrm{HC}(\mathrm{con}(A, B)^{(2)}) = \mathrm{HC}(A^{(2)})\mathrm{HC}(B^{(2)})$. Therefore

$$Q_{s+t+2}(\mathrm{con}(A, B)) = \mathrm{HC}(A)\mathrm{HC}(B) + \mathrm{HC}(A^{(2)})\mathrm{HC}(B^{(2)}). \tag{4.4}$$

Let $a := \sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i$ and

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a^{-1} & a^{-1} & \dots & a^{-1} & a^{-1} \\ a_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \\ a_2 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ a_3 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_s & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

It is easy to verify that $\mathrm{HC}(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i a^{-1} = 1$ and $\mathrm{HC}(A^2) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i^2 (a^{-1})^2 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{s} a_i^2\right) a^{-2} = 0$.

Thus we get with (4.4)

$$Q_{s+t+2}(\mathrm{con}(A, B)) = \mathrm{HC}(A)\mathrm{HC}(B) + \mathrm{HC}(A^{(2)})\mathrm{HC}(B^{(2)}) = \mathrm{HC}(B)$$

for every $(t \times t)$-matrix B.

Thus the Hamiltonian cycle family (HC_n) is a p-projection of (Q_n) and the claim follows. □

4.5 Corollary. *a) (Q_n) is* VNP-p-*complete over* $\mathbb{C}$.

b) (Q_n) is VNP-p-*complete over any field of characteristic greater than* 2.

Proof. a) Set $s := 2$ and $a_1 = 1$ and $a_2 = i$. We have $a_1 + a_2 = 1 + i \neq 0$ and $a_1^2 + a_2^2 = 0$ and thus the claim follows by Lemma 4.3.

b) Let $p > 2$ be the characteristic of the field and set $s := p$. We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\frac{p-1}{2}} 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{p+1}{2}} (-1) = -1 \neq 0$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\frac{p-1}{2}} 1^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{p+1}{2}} (-1)^2 = p \cdot 1 = 0.$$

With Lemma 4.3 the claim follows. □

5 Conclusion

We have shown that for all fields c-reductions and p-projections differ in power. Note that one could show versions of Theorem 3.3 for essentially all other complexity classes from arithmetic circuit complexity, as long as they contain complete families of homogeneous polynomials and the polynomial X. Since the proofs are essentially identical, we have not shown these results here.

We have also shown that the question which families are complete under which reductions also depends on the field. This indicates that understanding the exact power of different reduction notions is probably very complicated.

Another question is with respect to the naturalness of our separating examples. They have been specifically designed for our results and apart from that we do not consider them very interesting. Can one show that the more natural polynomials in [BK09, dRA12, DMM$^+$14] which were shown to be complete under c-reductions are not complete under p-projections?

References

[BK09] I. Briquel and P. Koiran. A Dichotomy Theorem for Polynomial Evaluation. *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2009*, pages 187–198, 2009.

[Bü00] P. Bürgisser. *Completeness and Reduction in Algebraic Complexity Theory.* Algorithms and computation in mathematics. Springer, Berlin, New York, 2000.

[DMM+14] Arnaud Durand, Meena Mahajan, Guillaume Malod, Nicolas de Rugy-Altherre, and Nitin Saurabh. Homomorphism polynomials complete for VP. In Venkatesh Raman and S. P. Suresh, editors, *34th International Conference on Foundation of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2014, December 15-17, 2014, New Delhi, India*, volume 29 of *LIPIcs*, pages 493–504. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2014.

[dRA12] N. de Rugy-Altherre. A Dichotomy Theorem for Homomorphism Polynomials. In *MFCS 2012*, pages 308–322, 2012.

[HO02] L.A. Hemaspaandra and M. Ogihara. *The Complexity Theory Companion*. Texts in theoretical computer science. Springer, Berlin, New York, 2002.

[Mah14] M. Mahajan. Algebraic complexity classes. In Manindra Agrawal and Vikraman Arvind, editors, *Perspectives in Computational Complexity*, volume 26 of *Progress in Computer Science and Applied Logic*, pages 51–75. Springer International Publishing, 2014.

[MS16] Meena Mahajan and Nitin Saurabh. Some complete and intermediate polynomials in algebraic complexity theory. In Alexander S. Kulikov and Gerhard J. Woeginger, editors, *Computer Science - Theory and Applications - 11th International Computer Science Symposium in Russia, CSR 2016, St. Petersburg, Russia, June 9-13, 2016, Proceedings*, volume 9691 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 251–265. Springer, 2016.

[Pav03] A. Pavan. Comparison of reductions and completeness notions. *SIGACT News*, 31(3):906–918, 2003.

[Val79] L.G. Valiant. Completeness Classes in Algebra. In *STOC 1979*, pages 249–261. ACM, 1979.

[Val82] L.G. Valiant. Reducibility by algebraic projections. In *Logic and Algorithmic: an International Symposium in honor of Ernst Specker*, Monogr. No. 30 de l'Enseign. Math., pages 365–380. 1982.